

of congenital heart disease in their offspring and necessity for continued medical surveillance. These issues have yet to be resolved.

ABRAHAM M. RUDOLPH, MD
*Professor of Medicine
 Vice Chairman, Department of Pediatrics
 (Cardiology)
 Professor, Department of Obstetrics,
 Gynecology and Reproductive
 Sciences and Physiology
 University of California, San Francisco
 School of Medicine*

REFERENCES

1. Edwards JE, Carey LS, Neufeld HN, et al: Congenital Heart Disease. Philadelphia, W B Saunders, 1965
2. Garson A Jr, Nihill MR, McNamara DG, et al: Status of the adult and adolescent after repair of tetralogy of Fallot. *Circulation* 1979 Jun; 59:1232-1240
3. Graham TP Jr: Ventricular performance in adults after operation for congenital heart disease. *Am J Cardiol* 1982; 50:612-620
4. Liberthson RR, Boucher GA, Strauss HW, et al: Right ventricular function in adult atrial septal defect. *Am J Cardiol* 1981; 47:56-60
5. Hoffman JIE: The natural history of congenital isolated pulmonic and aortic stenosis. *Annu Rev Med* 1969; 20:15-28
6. Liberthson RR, Pennington DG, Jacobs ML, et al: Coarctation of the aorta: Review of 234 patients and clarification of management problems. *Am J Cardiol* 1979 Apr; 43:835-840
7. Maron BJ, Humphries JO, Rowe RD, et al: Prognosis of surgically corrected coarctation of the aorta. *Circulation* 1973; 47:119-126
8. Fishman NH, Hof RB, Rudolph AM, et al: Models of congenital heart disease in fetal lambs. *Circulation* 1978; 58:354-364

A Gateway to Biostatistics

ELSEWHERE IN THIS ISSUE appears the article "An Introduction to Biostatistics" by Sacks and Glantz. The authors present what is actually an annotated bibliography that gives an overview of the subject, with special emphasis on the interpretation of the results and conclusions of clinical studies as these are reported in the medical literature. Even a scanning of their commentaries brings home the fact that the conclusions reached in published papers too often are not supported by the given data when these are subjected to careful and critical statistical analysis. Some very reputable medical journals fall victim to such errors.

Perhaps it is time for researchers and clinicians alike to learn more about how to judge for themselves the accuracy of the conclusions reported in any given published paper. The paper by Sacks and Glantz may be viewed as a gateway to biostatistics for physicians who wish to learn more about how to evaluate what they read in the medical literature—even in this journal.

MSMW